DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 031 SO 034 410

AUTHOR	Torney-Purta, Judith; Richardson, Wendy Klandl
TITLE	Trust in Government and Civic Engagement among Adolescents in Australia, England, Greece, Norway, and the United States.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Boston, MA, August 29-September 1, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Attitude Measures; Case Studies; *Citizenship Education; Comparative Analysis; Cross Cultural Studies; *Democracy; Foreign Countries; Government (Administrative Body); *Political Attitudes; *Predictor Variables; Public Opinion; School Role; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The goal of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Civic Education Study has been to examine, in a comparative framework, the political socialization of adolescents as they prepare for their roles as citizens of democracies. Approximately 90,000 students from the modal grade for 14-year-olds from nationally representative samples in 28 countries were tested during 1999. This paper focuses on the predictors of four different types of political engagement: (1) electoral, (2) partisan, (3) volunteer, and (4) protest. The potentially influential factors examined were knowledge of democracy and skills in interpreting information, sense of trust in government-related institutions, and aspects of the schools (perceptions of curriculum, sense of efficacy developed in the school culture, perceived encouragement of discussion in the classroom, and current participation in organizations). Countries profiled in the paper include Australia, England, Greece, Norway, and the United States. Between-country and within-country patterns indicated multiple modes of engaged citizenship resulting from the political socialization process inside and outside school. By teaching knowledge, emphasizing civic topics in the curriculum and imparting beliefs in the importance of various adult activities and by ensuring a participatory culture, schools can make a difference in preparing students for citizenship. A role for organizations, both in general and those specifically related to political and voluntary activities, is also indicated. The theoretical base for the paper is E. Wenger's work on communities of practice. Includes five tables. Contains 25 references. Information about the database of the IEA Civic Education Study is appended. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 473 031

Trust in Government and Civic Engagement among Adolescents in Australia, England, Greece, Norway, and the United States.

Judith Torney-Purta
Wendy Klandl Richardson

SO 034 410

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Torney-Purta
W. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Trust in Government and Civic Engagement among Adolescents in Australia, England, Greece, Norway and the United States

Judith Torney-Purta
Chair, International Steering Committee for the
IEA Civic Education Study
Professor of Human Development, College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

and

Wendy Klandl Richardson
Department of Human Development

Contact: **Jt22@umail.umd.edu**
Web Page: www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/

American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 2002.

[1] The report of the first phase, ***Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project,*** is available from IEA Amsterdam, contact department@iea.nl. The report from the testing of 14-year-olds that took place in 1999 during Phase 2 is entitled ***Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*** (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz, 2001). It can be ordered from its North American distributor, the American Bar Association Committee on Public Education (product code 235-0042). To place these orders call 1-800-285-2221. Major credit cards are accepted. The report of data from the upper secondary population of 17-19 year olds, ***Civic Knowledge and Engagement at the Upper Secondary Level in Sixteen Countries*** (Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, and Nikolova, 2002) was released on July 16, 2002. The text of both reports are on the Study's web page **www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/**, along with the instruments and references to publications reporting more in-depth analysis (for example an article in six languages in the September 2001 issue of ***Prospects*** and an article in ***Applied Developmental Science, vol 6 (4)*** focusing on the role of the school). The web page also contains details of the release of data for analysis by other researchers late in 2002, and links to national reports.

Major support for Phase 1 of the IEA Study came from the Pew Charitable Trusts. Major support for Phase 2 of the IEA Study came from the DFG (German Science Foundation) to the Humboldt University of Berlin and from the William T. Grant Foundation to the University of Maryland. A small grant from CIRCLE (the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement at the School of Public Affairs at the University of Maryland) was instrumental in some of the analysis reported here. Assistance from Jo-Ann Amadeo is gratefully acknowledged.

The goal of the IEA Civic Education Study, with data collected in 1999 and 2000 from 140,000 young people aged 14 and 16-19 from 29 countries, has been to examine in a comparative framework the political socialization of adolescents as they prepare to undertake their roles as citizens in democracy. In the past when such issues concerning adolescents and adults have been the focus of research, large scale assessments and their analysis within a given country have often been the method chosen (Niemi & Junn, 1999 studying adolescents and Burns, Schlozman and Verba, 2001 studying adults) although interview methodologies and community studies have recently been represented (Conover & Searing, 2000). Only a few times in the years from the 1970's through the early 1990's have international comparative studies been undertaken of young people (Torney, Oppenheim & Farnen, 1975; Flanagan, et al, 1998, and Hahn, 1998). Many gaps in our understanding of this important process can be filled by analysis of the newly available IEA data (and one of the purposes of a presentation such as this is to suggest preliminary answers to some questions and further analyses).

The IEA Study's data can be explored in a variety of theoretical directions and with a variety of methodologies. Because of the massive amount of data in the study, narrowing the focus is essential. This particular report will focus on the predictors of four different types of political engagement: electoral, partisan, volunteer, and protest. The potentially influential factors to be examined are knowledge of democracy and skills in interpreting information, sense of trust in government related institutions, several aspects of the schools (perceptions of curriculum, sense of efficacy developed in the school culture, perceived encouragement of discussion in the classroom, and current participation in organizations). There is some evidence that youth in long standing democracies could, at least up to September 2001, be characterized as the "take-it-for-granted generation." They seemed to be exploring some new definitions of citizenship identity (involving community service or environmental action), but they were less inclined to relate themselves to traditional political structures such as parties or to patriotism. Although they were prepared to vote, most were at worst cynical or at best apathetic about other traditional forms of conventional political participation such as engaging in political discussion or joining a political party. The purpose of the paper will be to present regression analysis from the IEA civic education study's data from 14-year-olds (collected in 1999) to address issues relating to sources of these different types of politically engaged behavior.

In the IEA Civic Education study (described below) an attempt has been made to move beyond the earlier socialization research work which might be described as the "who done it" model (that is, looking at sources operating in an isolated and top-down fashion rather than interactively). To briefly review, study of the school as a source of political attitudes and knowledge abruptly slowed, in part because of a study in the late 1960's that failed to find a role for civics classes in knowledge or engagement (Langton and Jennings, 1968). In the late 1970's there was modest attention to the first IEA Civic Education Study which found from a testing 32,000 students in nine countries in 1971 that open climate for classroom discussion made a difference in civic knowledge and anti-authoritarianism although home background factors were also important (Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen, 1975). Studies were conducted in a number of countries in the

mid-to-late seventies giving some attention to schools and textbooks (Zureik and Pike, 1978). From the early 1980's until the late 1990's, when Niemi and Junn (1998) published a re-analysis of the 1988 U.S. NAEP civics data, political socialization was a dormant field of research in North America. The Niemi and Junn analysis focused only on 12th graders and on knowledge (with some attention to political trust). They did find that taking civic-related classes made a difference (although expected education was also important). The kind of theory that usually frames the work of educational or developmental psychologists has rarely been part of socialization studies, and there have been relatively modest contributions from researchers in these fields.

Some recent theorizing in psychology suggests possible new linkages, however. Socio-cultural theories, such as the situated cognition view of Lave and Wenger (1991) speak of the various groups to which young people are related as "situating" their learning or cognition and use the term "legitimate peripheral participation" to describe the observation by or partial participation of individuals who are young, relative newcomers or apprentices. In a more recent formulation Wenger (1998) has detailed some ramifications of a notion of "communities of practice," or overlapping membership groups ranging from work teams to community organizations to classrooms. In these groups individuals negotiate identities, acquire knowledge and skills that are meaningful as defined by the group, and are engaged in practice. Through experience that is either intentionally or unintentionally shaped and "scaffolded" by older group members, they gradually move away from peripheral participation to more central involvement.

The feeling of confidence in one's own abilities to influence both individuals and institutions involves a constellation of competencies studied for many years by those specializing in political science using the concept of "political efficacy". This concept is also important in the psychological theory of Bandura (2001), who has discussed the "sense of self-efficacy" and, more recently, "collective efficacy." The common core of efficacy is belief in one's ability to accomplish goals one has chosen (in the case of political efficacy the goal of improving the community or influencing governmental or political action). The concept of collective efficacy adds the idea that joining with a group to take action is often more effective than taking action by oneself. This work gives a new convergence point for studies by psychologists and political scientists. Likewise, the study of political identity in adolescence by psychologists has some affinities to recent concerns expressed by Conover and Searing (2000) regarding the lack of continuity in young people's views of politics and their inability to conceive of themselves enacting a civic or political identity as adults.

Socio-cultural theory, concepts of identity and of efficacy were central in developing the IEA Civic Education Study, a 1999 test and survey of more than 90,000 14-year-olds in 28 countries whose data provides the empirical basis for this discussion (and of the 50,000 16-19 year-olds in 16 countries whose results were recently released). This paper will address gaps in existing research on socialization in democracy including the absence of a comprehensive set of variables – for example, multiple aspects of types of civic participation and engagement, moderating factors, and distinct aspects of the school or of organizational participation. This analysis begins by identifying four types of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

potential future adult participation and continues to investigate the following research questions in five of the participating countries:

1. Are specific types of experiences in school and in informal organizations related to specific types of participation, or is this process general, non-differentiated and implicit?

2. What is the role of trust in government in participation?

A Description of The IEA Civic Education Study:

In the early 1990's the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (a comparative education association of nearly 60 member countries with headquarters in Amsterdam) began exploring the subject area of civic education in order to develop a measuring instrument and conduct a test and survey of young people using some of the recent methodological innovations in studies such as the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). The IEA Civic Education Study was designed in two phases, one more qualitative and the other more quantitative. The first phase utilized teams of researchers in each country who outlined the expectations which countries had for adolescents in civic-related subjects. Another purpose of this phase was to reach consensus among member countries about a common core of content about the fundamental principles of democracy and citizenship that might be assessed. Case studies concerning the expectations for learning about civic-related subjects by 14-year-olds were formulated within each participating nation (Torney-Purta, Schwille and Amadeo, 1999). The following countries had chapters in that book: Australia, Belgium (French), Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, England, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong (SAR), Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, and the United States. After a cross-national consensus building process of about 3 years, a considerable degree of agreement about a core set of expectations for civic education was achieved. Knowledge about democracy and its principles, sense of engagement and willingness to participate, legitimacy or attitude of trust in government, and attitudes about the rights of various groups to participate were all discussed in these case studies and formed the basis for the test and survey which comprise Phase 2 of the IEA Civic Education Study.

The IEA Civic Education researchers engaged in a 3-year process of development involving research co-ordinators from more than 20 countries and two pilot tests to arrive at an instrument suitable for class administration across countries, with clearly formulated items for translation into 20 languages. Fourteen-year-olds were tested because that was the last year of compulsory school in some countries wanting to participate.

These testing materials were elaborated during meetings of National Research Co-ordinators and shaped by votes on questions. The instrument included three core domains: Democracy, Democratic Institutions, and Citizenship; National Identity and International Relations; and Social Cohesion and Diversity. These domains were elaborated into a Content Framework using the Phase 1 national case study documents. The framework contained many topics from debates about building, consolidating, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

maintaining democracies, for example, incentives to participate in democracy, problems in transitions of government, characteristics and functions of elections and parties, citizens' rights, civic duties and obligations, and the role of organizations in civil society.

This framework of concepts formed the basis for constructing the test measuring civic knowledge and skills in interpreting political information (and may be found in the Appendix of Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz, 2001). The National Research Co-ordinators decided that only about half the testing time should be devoted to questions with right and wrong answers, however. The IEA instrument also included a measure of concepts of democracy, concepts of the good adult citizen, and concepts of the social and economic responsibilities of government (as well as attitudinal scales and items about the intent to participate in various civic and political behaviors).

The knowledge test was selected from a pool of 140 items and included 38-items measuring content knowledge (in the three domains described). This test was developed with Item Response Theory (IRT scaling) and is a psychometrically strong instrument. Twenty-five of these test items measured content knowledge (relating to democratic governmental structures, citizenship, international organizations, and social diversity) while thirteen measured skills in interpreting civic information (e.g., a political leaflet, political cartoons, a mock newspaper article). All were suitable for use across countries.

The test and survey were administered in 1999 to nationally representative samples of students in the modal grade for 14-year-olds totalling 90,000 students (see IEA standards in Martin, Rust, & Adams, 1999).[1] The European countries participating in Phase 2 were Belgium (French), Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, and Switzerland. In addition, Australia, Chile, Colombia, Hong Kong (SAR), and the United States participated. The report of the results of Phase 2 (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001) presents figures that detail the position of each country's students as "significantly above," "at" or "below" the international mean. A testing of older students (aged 16-19) took place (mainly in 2000) in 16 countries (not including the United States). The test was augmented to include some harder items, including a number measuring economic literacy. The survey was substantially the same as for the 14-years-olds. Those results, including differences between age groups, appear in Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, & Nikolova, 2002 (see also www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/).

1. Types or Modes of Civic Engagement:

1a It is generally agreed that there are multiple modes through which engaged citizenship can be expressed.

---

[1]In the IEA Civic Education Study each sampled school also surveyed three teachers of civic-related subjects (often history or social studies) who were teaching the tested class of students.

Some distinguish between *political engagement* usually meaning the activities conventionally associated with adult citizenship in relation to political institutions, and *civic engagement* which is a broader term including participation in activities to benefit the community without any necessary connection to political institutions. Just to name a few types of engagement, there is voting, voting after seeking information about candidates or issues, participating in discussion of political issues, affiliating with a political party, or a wider range of participation (including both activities conventionally associated with adults who are engaged in politics and also what is called social movement participation). Other distinctions can also be made, e.g., Milner's (2002) between participation at the municipal or national level and for adolescents the distinction between community volunteering and service learning (Billig, 2000). These activities also vary in the extent to which there is a potential for conflicting opinions (most substantial in protest and partisan activities, somewhat less likely for voting and least likely for volunteering, especially the type of volunteering that is likely to be available to most adolescents and young adults).

Even though multiple modes of participation are available to adolescents, the range of activities and levels of involvement accessible to them is somewhat limited. For example, adolescents may participate in an adult election campaign but are unlikely to hold decision making positions. It is therefore important to consider organizations where adolescents have the opportunity to engage in activities such as a student council or parliament where leadership opportunities may be available.

Many political scientists focus on voting or conventional activities. Seeking information during campaigns may be mentioned, but turning out individuals at the polls is usually the most critical. Other political scientists have focused on social capital and believe that organizational participation is key. Often educators focus on willingness to participate in community betterment activities. Still another group of educators is focused on information or knowledge. Not only are there differences between disciplines, but there are also differences in the views in different countries. Many educators in countries outside the United States are unconvinced about the value of community service, for example. Finally, in some parts of the world the sine qua non of civic engagement is willingness to protest against injustice. Empirical data cannot provide answers to questions of relative importance, but can provide a basis for an informed debate.

1b. The IEA Study's basic analysis found that many of these aspects of participation were related but the differences between them were also worth examining.

This presentation will focus on the multiple modes of citizen engagement, and a regression analyses will explore a differential prediction of four types of engagement (described in detail in a later section).

To begin with a cross-national review of ideas about citizenship, although 14-year-olds cannot vote, they can tell us about the norms they hold concerning the importance of adults' political activities. Measures of students' conceptualizations of norms for the good citizen in conventional political terms (voting, participating in political parties or

discussions) and in terms of participation in social movement activities (belonging to environmental or groups volunteering to benefit the community) were developed for the IEA Civic Education Study. It was clear that young people in the late 1990's believed that citizens should vote and obey the law, but apart from those activities, they were more supportive of social movement activities than of conventional political activities such as political party membership or discussing issues (see Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001).

Ratings of the importance for adult citizens of voting, discussing political issues, and joining parties formed a measure of Conventional Citizenship. The countries where scores on this measure were *above* the international mean included about half the post-Communist countries (Bulgaria, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and the Slovak Republic), all of the countries in southern Europe (Cyprus, Greece, Italy, and Portugal), and the United States. In contrast, several other post-Communist countries (Czech Republic, Estonia, Russian Federation, and Slovenia) as well as all the Northern European countries (Belgium (French), Denmark, England, Finland, Germany, Norway and Switzerland and also Australia) are *below* the international mean on the belief that it is important for adults to participate in conventional citizenship activities. In short, some of the post-Communist countries are high and some low in accepting the norms relating to political engagement as conventionally defined. As a group, however, adolescents in the countries from Southern Europe appear to have relatively strong commitments to conventional citizenship while those from Northern Europe believe these activities less important.[2] The distinction between conventional citizenship and social-movement citizenship will be revisited at a later point in the paper.

2. Knowledge in Relation to Participation and the School in Relation to Both:

2a. It is generally agreed that schools and teachers play a role in transmitting meaningful knowledge of civic and political processes as well as in forming some attitudes and behavioral intentions.

The school is the institution charged with providing a variety of content instruction and experience in citizenship practice to young people. In democracies this includes general literacy as well as information that may either be very abstract or quite concrete about democracy, political history, voting, and government structures. Schools in democratic countries are unlikely to be expected to provide information about candidates or parties and they are unlikely to try to organize protest activities (often fearing accusations of indoctrination for engaging in any of these activities).

---

[2] The countries chosen for analysis in this paper were Australia, England, Greece, Norway and the United States. These include two Northern countries and one Southern European country as well as the two English-speaking countries outside of Europe. They present some range in economic resources as well as levels of civic engagement. All have civil society organizations available for students to join (which was not the case in many of the post-Communist countries), and in these countries there have recently been debates about the role of schooling and organizations in civic engagement (see the Phase 1 report from the IEA Study, Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999).

The strongest previous research on schools was Niemi and Junn's (1998) reanalysis of the 1988 NAEP (National Assessment of Education Progress) civic data for twelfth graders. They concluded that taking civics classes made a difference, but also found that expected education (whether the students intended to continue schooling past high school) was an extremely strong predictor. Their predictors tended to be general rather than specific (e.g., which topics had been studied).

It is also assumed that schools do transmit knowledge to students and assess whether they have learned it (in the United States often through multiple choice tests). A recent review (Galston, 2001) also shows that within the United States civic knowledge relates to participation, a point made on a cross national basis by Milner (2002).

2b. There are many aspects of schooling that remain contested, however. Among them are the role of schools as model democracies and the effectiveness of different emphases in the curriculum and modes of instruction. These issues regarding schools are contextualized within concerns about the impact of more general factors (political interest or trust) as well as the impact of the home.

The Phase 1 national cases studies of IEA indicated a variety of patterns in the offering of civic education content to 14-year-olds, sometimes in a separate course but quite frequently integrated into other courses, or sometimes without a coherent plan (Schwille & Amadeo, 2002). In the Phase 2 survey, most teachers believed that civic education was most meaningful and effective when it was integrated into courses such as social studies or history. However, having civic education as a specific subject was appealing in a number of the post-Communist countries (probably as a way to establish a protected place in the school schedule for these educational objectives).

Curricular guidelines are influential in determining what is taught, but according to the teachers surveyed in the IEA study the guidelines' prescriptions did not always match their professional judgments about effective teaching. In most countries teachers reported that their instruction emphasized the transmission of knowledge. However, many teachers appeared to have a vision of civic education that emphasized looking at material more deeply or exploring its relationships to participation or values. The teachers perceived a tension between the stress on factual knowledge and other approaches that might involve students more actively. This tension seemed especially prominent in Norway where 80% of the teachers were emphasizing knowledge while only 7% believed that was the best way to teach in this subject area.

The actual instructional methods reported by teachers also show an emphasis on knowledge transmission. Across countries textbooks, worksheets and recitation predominated. Role-playing exercises and projects were not used as often. In the United States there are data from students who were asked about the instructional methods used in their classrooms. This information corroborates what was said above about other countries. Baldi et al. (2001) indicated in the U.S. national report that reading from the textbook and filling out worksheets were the most frequent activities, with role playing,

10 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

debates, discussions and more interactive lessons much less frequent according to students.

One set of identical questions about what is taught (learned) in school was asked internationally to both students and teachers. Similar percentages of teachers and students within a given country agreed that students learned how to cooperate in groups with other students, to understand people who had different ideas, and to contribute to solving social problems in the community. In contrast, the proportion of teachers within each country who believed that students learned about voting in school was much higher than the proportion of students in that country who believed they had learned about this topic.

After considering the variety of school-related items and scales in the IEA instrument, the following predictor variables were chosen to explore links between school and the likelihood of electoral, partisan, volunteer, and protest participation:

- Content knowledge and interpretive skills – an IRT scale based on 38 items. Political information has been found in previous studies to be a predictors of participation (e.g., Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996 and Milner, 2002). The five countries used in this analysis all had scores above the international mean.

- An important aspect of school culture is whether respondents believe that students in their school can get together to effect change or solve problems. The IRT scale was called Confidence in Participation at School and is similar to a school efficacy measure. Greece had the highest scores on this scale, with the other 4 countries at or just above the international mean. Females felt more efficacious than males.

- An important aspect of classroom culture is whether students perceive that they are encouraged to engage in discussion in their classrooms and whether others respect their opinions. The IRT scale was called Open Classroom Climate for Discussion and all 5 countries had scores at or above the international mean (though, as with all of these variables, there were variations within countries and schools). Females were more likely to perceive an open climate than males.

- In the absence of a teacher-based "opportunity to learn" measure (such as that included in some other IEA studies), students were asked how much they agreed that in school they had "learned about the importance of elections and voting" and about "how to contribute to solving problems in the community." The first item was used as a predictor for likelihood of informed voting and for likelihood of joining a party; the second item was used as a predictor for "likelihood of volunteering in the community" and "likelihood of participating in a non-violent protest march."

The following variables were also included as predictors

- Discussion with parents has been found in research by both political scientists and communication specialists to be related to civic engagement. Two questions about the frequency of discussion of national and international issues (respectively) were the only questions about home political atmosphere in the instrument (due to privacy restrictions in countries such as Germany and the United States). These items were averaged to produce a Discussion with Parents variable.

- A single item asking the respondents' to rate their Political Interest was included. Males had higher scores than females on this item in 4 of the 5 countries.

- There has been considerable debate about the role of trust in government in stimulating (or constraining) political engagement (Norris, 1999). Items relating to Trust in Government-Related Institutions and very similar to those in adult instruments were used in the IEA instrument and were IRT scaled. Young people in stable/durable democracies tended to have higher levels of trust than those in countries where democracy is recent (or has been frequently disrupted). This replicates results in a number of adult studies (Inglehart, 1997).

3. Specific and Non-specific Effects of School Factors and of Organizational Membership in relation to Participation/Engagement:

3a. It is generally agreed that participation in voluntary organizations (both in and outside school) is valuable for individuals and for the creation of social capital in the societies in which they live.

Although these issues receive special impetus from Putnam's work in Italy and the United States, a more wide ranging set of discussions may be found in van Deth, Maraffi, Newton, & Whiteley (1999) and Dekker and Uslander (2001), especially the chapters by Stolle, Hooghe, and the introduction and conclusion by Uslander and Dekker. Burns, Schlozman, & Verba (2001) make an argument for participation in school activities serving a function in reducing the gap in adult participation between men and women, particularly because they appear to enhance civic skills (especially those relating to functioning in a group).

3b. An important issue for analysis is the extent to which pre-adult organizational participation (either extracurricularly in school or outside of school) is important. Second, is the question whether this is likely to be a specific effect or a general one. This analysis explores the influence of young people's organizational membership on four types of future participation. These were examined in the context of various general and specific school and organizational factors.

Three types of organizational participation were entered as predictors:

- A different specific organizational participation item was chosen as a predictor for each of the four criterion (predicted) variables. For likelihood of informed voting whether the student reported belonging to a school council/parliament was

the specific organizational measure used. For likelihood of joining a political party whether the student reported belong to a politically-affiliated youth organization was used. For likelihood of volunteering whether the student reported belonging to a group conducting voluntary activities to help the community was used. For likelihood of marching in a non-violent protest whether the student reported belonging to an environment organization was used. All came from a measure asking students to check to which of 15 organizations they belonged.

- Participation in a religious organization was one item from this measure and was used as a predictor.

- A general organizational participation measure consisted of a sum of answers to the 10 questions regarding organizations *other than* the five organizations mentioned in the previous bullets.

In order to explore these issues, four different aspects of expected adult participation were chosen, one distinctly related to political institutions and likely to be encouraged by schools (voting after getting information about candidates), one distinctly political and conflictual but not likely to be discussed in school (joining a political party), one with civic rather than political dimensions and likely to be encouraged by schools in some countries (volunteering time to help the community), and one with considerable conflict potential and related to social movements (participating in a non-violent protest march). To give perspective, the proportion of these 14-year-old-respondents saying that they planned to vote in national elections was about 80% across countries. In most (but not all) countries this figure is higher than the proportion of the youngest members of the electorate who actually have been voting in recent years. Again students from the Southern European countries tend to be at or above the international mean in likelihood of voting (as they were in subscribing to the norms of conventional citizenship and in the other aspects of participation as well).

In summary, the following 4 variables were chosen as predicted (criterion) variables for the regression analyses (each asking about the likelihood of engaging the activity as an adult):

- Voting in national elections and getting information about candidates before voting.
- Joining a political party
- Volunteering in the community
- Participating in a non-violent protest march

Moving to the results, we now look at how the predictors of the four different aspects of participation differ. As Table 1 (a-e) indicates, voting (and informed voting) are influenced by all aspects of the school included in this analysis: civic knowledge (much of which is acquired through education), the confidence students gain about their ability to participate, and the emphasis on elections and voting implemented as part of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

curriculum. Open classroom climate is also a significant predictor. Discussion with parents is also important. General organizational participation makes a small contribution except in Greece, while participation specifically in a school parliament/council is positive but relatively weak (in two countries only). Religious participation makes a small positive contribution only in the United States. Trust in government-related institutions and political interest make moderate significant contributions. In summary, school-related factors can play an important role in promoting students' stated willingness to vote in an informed way.

In contrast, the *predictors of future partisanship are somewhat different*. Bear in mind that only about 20% of students think it even moderately likely that they will join a party (while about 80% expect to vote). There was also considerably more variability between countries in the view of political parties (which was quite negative in many) than in the view of voting (which was generally positive across countries). Political interest is the strongest motivator of potential party membership. Then there is a big drop in size of predictors, although discussion with parents is important in some countries along with trust in government-related institutions. Civic knowledge has very minor predictive power (and is negative in Australia). The number of organizations of all kinds to which the student belongs and also specifically politically partisan youth organizations are important in some countries (and these coefficients are of moderate size). Students who are already interested in politics at age fourteen and who have already become part of an affiliated organization (or organizations in general) are the ones likely to think of themselves as future party members. Expected party membership appears to be influenced primarily by out of school factors, political interest and in some countries the availability of a partisan organization designed to appeal to young people.

The intent to volunteer time is somewhat more prevalent but also less predictable (using these variables) than either voting or political party membership. Here again, learning in school, in this case about community problems which might be addressed by volunteering, impacts the perceived likelihood of involvement as an adult volunteer. Specific current experience with an organization giving service to the community along with general confidence in the efficacy of getting together to take action in groups that are close to them (e.g., with other students in their schools) are both important. Discussion with parents also plays a role, as do opportunities to participate in classroom discussion and in organizations generally There is little evidence that volunteering has much connection to political issues or interests. Notably neither trust in government nor interest have much impact on participation through volunteering. In this area some aspects of schooling (though not political knowledge per se) and especially out-of-school community experiences are important in promoting willingness to be an adult volunteer.

In predicting non-violent protest behavior, the percent of variance accounted for is quite small, suggesting either that this is not a clearly developed predisposition in young people (and that they are responding without knowing what it entails) or that we do not have powerful enough variables in the set of predictors. Discussion with parents is the only variable in this analysis that has even a moderate positive impact on willingness to participate in non-violent protests as an adult. Schools do not appear to be doing much to

orient students toward protest activity, although learning about problems in the community does appear to have some influence. In two of the countries, Australia and Greece, students who are less trusting of government-related institutions are more likely to think of themselves as potential protestors. This relationship is not significant in the other countries.

In summary, among 14-year-olds the intent to be an informed voter seems primarily to be a product of school curricular emphasis and civic knowledge. Intent to become a strong partisan appears to be primarily the product of out-of-school experience and general interest in the topics on which parties take positions. Intent to volunteer time to help people in the community seems to have roots both outside and to some extent inside school (at least to the extent that students get a sense of efficacy of activities there and study community problems).

There is modest support for the value of specific organizational participation, strongest for organizations that conduct voluntary activities in the community and least for school councils or parliaments. Religious organizations seem to vary considerably across countries in their impact.

It may be that students see obvious connections between volunteer activities as adolescents and adult volunteering, while such connections between participation in a school council and voting in national elections may not be as obvious. General organizational participation has some influence (though further analysis will be undertaken on this issue taking into account the different structures and functions of youth organizations in different countries). Likewise trust in government was a significant but modest positive predictor of three types of engagement (strongest for informed voting), a relationship that also needs further exploration.

Summary:

Between-country and within-country patterns indicate multiple modes of engaged citizenship resulting from the political socialization process inside and outside school. By teaching knowledge, emphasizing civic topics in the curriculum and imparting beliefs in the importance of various adult activities and by ensuring a participatory culture, schools can make a difference in preparing students for citizenship. A role for organizations, both in general and those specifically related to political and voluntary activities, is also indicated.

That the political socialization process takes place both inside and outside schools is consistent with the socio-culture approach. As Wenger (1998) has noted, the notion of "legitimate peripheral participation" would suggest that students who participate in organizations that are similar to adult organizations may develop nascent skills to join an adult community of civic and political practice. Adolescents may, however, need explicit guidance in ways to connect current organizational participation with future adult activity, especially in the political realm.

References

Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. *Civic Knowledge and Engagement: An IEA Study of Upper Secondary Students in Sixteen Countries.* Amsterdam: IEA, 2002.

Baldi, S., Perie, M., Skidmore, D., Greenberg, E. & Hahn, C. *What Democracy Means to Ninth Graders: U.S Results from the International IEA Civic Education Study* (NCES 2001-096). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2001.

Bandura, A. "Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective." *Annual Review of Psychology,* 52 (2001): 1-26.

Billig, S. "Research on K-12 School Based Learning: The Evidence Builds." *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Burns, N., Schlozman, K. L., & Verba, S. *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality and Political Participation.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press., 2001.

Conover, P. J. & Searing, D. D. "A Political Socialization Perspective." In L. M. McDonnell, P. M. Timpane, and R. Benjamin (Eds.), *Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education.* (pp. 991-124) (2000) Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Dekker, P & Uslander, E. *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life.* London: Routledge, 2001.

Delli Carpini, M.X. & Ketter, S. *What American Know about Politics and Why it Matters.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Flanagan, C., Bowes, J., Jonsson, B., Csapo, B. & Sheblanova, E. "Ties that bind: Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries." *Journal of Social Issues*, 54 (1998): 457-475.

Galston, W. "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education." *Annual Review of Political Science,* 4 (2001): 217-34.

Inglehart, R. *Modernization and Post-Modernization.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Martin, M. Rust, K. & Adams, R. *Testing Standards for IEA Studies.* Amsterdam: IEA, 1999.

Milner, H.. *Civic Literacy: How Informed Citizens Make Democracy Work.* Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2002.

Niemi, R. & Junn, J. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Norris, P. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Schwille, J. & Amadeo, J. The Paradoxical Situation of Civic Education in Schools: Ubiquitous and Yet Elusive. In *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship, Volume 5,* G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta, & J. Schwille, eds. Elsevier Science, Ltd., 2002, 105-206.

Torney, J., Oppenheim, A. N. & Farnen, R. *Civic Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study.* New York: John Wiley, 1975.

Torney-Purta, J. "Civic Knowledge, Beliefs about Democratic Institutions, and Civic Engagement among 14-year-olds." *Prospects*, 31 (September, 2001): 279-292.

Torney-Purta, J. "The School's Role in Developing Civic Engagement: A Study of Adolescents in Twenty-Eight Countries." *Applied Developmental Science*, 6 (2002): 202-211.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen.* Amsterdam: IEA (In Amsterdam Fax: 31 20 420 7136 or in North America, Distributed by the American Bar Association Division on Public Education, 1-800-285-2221, product code 235-0042) Also: www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/

Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. & Amadeo, J. *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project.* Amsterdam: IEA, 1999.

Torney-Purta, J. & Stapleton, L. "Multilevel structural models for school factors predicting civic knowledge and the likelihood of voting in three countries." Manuscript.

Van Deth, J., Maraffi, M., Newton, K., and Whiteley, P.. *Social Capital and European Democracy.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Wenger, E. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Zureik, E. & Pike, R. M. *Socialization and Values in Canadian Society. Volume One: Political Socialization.* Toronto: MacMillan, 1978.

Table 1a: Predictors of Political Participation for Adolescents in Australia - Standardized betas

	Informed Voting	Party Participation	Volunteer	Protest
Adj. R^2	.294	.207	.182	.105
Knowledge	.235**	-.066**	-.106**	.065*
Confidence at school	.173**	ns	.149**	.060*
Class climate	.125**	ns	.071**	Ns
Learned at school	.082**	ns	.195**	.131**
Specific org.	ns	.074**	.104**	.105**
Religious org.	-.044*	-.055*	.077**	Ns
General org.	.046*	.076**	.090**	.063*
Discuss parents	.180**	.166**	.060*	.109**
Interest politics	.042*	.330**	ns	.100**
Trust in govt.	.103**	.052*	ns	-.068*
N	2239	2150	2107	2145

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .001$

Table 1b: Predictors of Political Participation for Adolescents in Greece – Standardized betas

	Informed Voting	Party Participation	Volunteer	Protest
Adj. R^2	.225	.171	.118	.096
Knowledge	.215**	ns	-.114**	.081**
Confidence at school	.164**	-.070**	.157**	.137**
Class climate	.140**	-.038*	.130**	ns
Learned at school	.082**	.059*	.124**	.106**
Specific org.	.039*	.096**	.076**	ns
Religious org.	ns	ns	ns	ns
General org.	ns	ns	ns	ns
Discuss parents	.137**	.076**	.100**	.148**
Interest politics	.044*	.331**	-.049*	ns
Trust in govt.	.113**	.071**	ns	-.040*
N	2829	2715	2742	2724

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .001$

Table 1c Predictors of Political Participation for Adolescents in Norway - Standardized betas

	Informed Voting	Party Participation	Volunteer	Protest
Adj. R^2	.256	.222	.098	.116
Knowledge	.251**	ns	-.078**	.118**
Confidence at school	.107**	ns	.074*	ns
Class climate	.061*	ns	.077*	ns
Learned at school	.136**	.063*	.098**	.074*
Specific org.	.046*	.125**	.059*	.058*
Religious org.	ns	ns	.059*	ns
General org.	.054*	.043*	.094**	.089**
Discuss parents	.115**	.104**	.139**	.172**
Interest politics	.087**	.287**	ns	.079*
Trust in govt.	.121**	.085**	ns	ns
N	2028	1867	1836	1820

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .001$

Table 1d Predictors of Political Participation for Adolescents in England - Standardized betas

	Informed Voting	Party Participation	Volunteer	Protest
Adj. R^2	.272	.205	.199	.105
Knowledge	.253**	ns	ns	ns
Confidence at school	.185**	ns	.127**	.076**
Class climate	.063*	ns	.129**	ns
Learned at school	.125**	.139**	.133**	.092**
Specific org.	ns	ns	.132**	ns
Religious org.	ns	ns	ns	ns
General org.	.062*	ns	.072*	.096**
Discuss parents	.132**	.170**	.115**	.194**
Interest politics	.054*	.237**	.057*	.072*
Trust in govt.	.096**	.101**	.063*	ns
N	2083	1984	2044	1999

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .001$

Table 1e Predictors of Political Participation for Adolescents the United States – Standardized betas

	Informed Voting	Party Participation	Volunteer	Protest
Adj. R^2	.335	.245	.202	.110
Knowledge	.230**	.138**	ns	ns
Confidence at school	.123**	ns	.129**	.076*
Class climate	.098**	ns	.063*	ns
Learned at school	.128**	.140**	.121**	.082*
Specific org.	ns	ns	.175**	.089**
Religious org.	.103**	ns	ns	ns
General org.	.078**	.073**	.092**	.065*
Discuss parents	.154**	.136**	.145**	.131**
Interest politics	.103**	.268**	ns	.134**
Trust in govt.	.092**	.067*	.049*	ns
N	1900	1761	1808	1729

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .001$

Appendix: Information about the Data Base of the IEA Civic Education Study:

IEA expects to release the data from the 90,000 14-year-olds in late 2002 and from the 50,000 upper secondary students either at the same time or in 2003.

The IEA report issued in March 2001 (Torney-Purta et al, 2001) is a presentation of data from 14-year-olds in all 28 countries, primarily between country analysis. Single level path models for civic knowledge (total) and likelihood of voting are included. There are several journal articles (Torney-Purta, 2001, 2002).

What has and what has not been emphasized so far in the analysis:

- IRT scales have been analyzed but many single items and other item groups not yet examined.
    - 38 item knowledge and skills test examined in 3 IRT scales
    - 25 concepts of democracy items examined individually but not in scales
    - 15 concepts of citizenship items examined in 2 IRT scales (conventional citizenship and social movement citizenship) but not as individual items (and 5 items not included in either scale)
    - 12 trust items of which 6 were examined in the IRT scale on trust in government-related institutions (3 individual items on media were examined)

  Many other items not examined, including political efficacy, the existence of discrimination, and a large number of the activity/engagement items. See **www.wam.umd.edu/~iea/** for the instrument and an indication of which items have formed IRT scales. See also appendices of Torney-Purta et al, 2001.

- Data which scaled across the 28 countries have been examined but little has been done with regional groups (although some national reports and an article in the *European Journal of Education* are exceptions).

- Single level models have been explored but as yet few multi-level models.

- Central tendency has been examined but not distributions or extreme groups.

- A few countries have instituted new civic education requirements (usually based on their poor performance), but little attempt has yet been made to link to policy issues more generally.

The Civic Education International Coordinating Center at the Humboldt University of Berlin bears major responsibility for preparing the data and the technical report. However, Judith Torney-Purta, (Chair of the International Steering Committee for the IEA Civic Education Study) **jt22@umail.umd.edu**, will continue to provide information about the *international* data release and dissemination plans (and to refer questions that she cannot answer). A copy of the CD with the U.S. data only may be requested from Laurence.Ogle@ed.gov.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

SO

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Trust in Government and Civic Engagement among Adolescents in Australia, England, Greece, Norway and the United States	
Author(s): Wendy Richardson, Judith Torney-Purta	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Judith Torney-Purta + Wendy Richardson	Printed Name/Position/Title: Judith Torney-Purta, Professor + Wendy Richardson
Organization/Address: University of Maryland, Dept. of Human Development 3304 Benjamin Bldg., College Park, MD 20742	Telephone: 301-405-2806 FAX: 301-405-2891
	E-Mail Address: jt22@umail.umd.edu Date: 10.29.02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)